

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

HARRELL S. BRANNAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

KEVIN FORCE, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 4:14-CV-60-JAR

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's pro se "Motion to Compelling Address," requesting the Court order the Bridgeton Police Department to supply the United States Marshals Service with the last known address of Defendant Dale Rowe for service of summons. (Doc. No. 15) A review of the file indicates that Rowe was properly served on April 23, 2014. (Doc. No. 23) Peter Dunne and Pitzer Snodgrass, P.C., have entered their appearance on behalf of Officer Rowe (Doc. No. 25) and filed an answer on his behalf. (Doc. No. 26) Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion will be denied as moot.

Plaintiff also requests the Court order the Bridgeton Police Department to submit to the Court a complete copy of Rowe's employment records, and particularly any disciplinary records, to assist him in establishing his claims of abuse by Rowe. Plaintiff's discovery request is improperly filed with the Court. The Court cannot provide legal advice to any party, but notes that if Plaintiff seeks to obtain documents from a nonparty, he must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and in particular with the provisions of Rule 45.

Finally, Plaintiff requests the Court reconsider his request for appointment of counsel.

The Court finds nothing in the record, however, to cause it to reconsider its previous order denying Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. Again, this excessive force and unlawful arrest case is neither factually nor legally complex. Moreover, Plaintiff has clearly demonstrated that he is able to articulate and present his claims.


Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's "Motion to Compelling Address" [15] is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's request for discovery from the Bridgeton Police Department is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Court's order denying appointment of counsel is **DENIED**.

Dated this 30th day of May, 2014.


JOHN A. ROSS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE